
From: Rupert Sheldrake <████████>
Sent: Tuesday, July 12, 2016 1:42 PM
To: jeffrey E.
Subject: Re: fields

Dear jeffrey,

They could be probability fields themselves, you're right. When I first put forward this hypothesis I corresponded with Karl Popper, the philosopher of science, about it and he thought morphic fields sounded like what he called propensity fields, a very similar concept to your probability fields. The problem is that when you propose this idea to people they just can't grasp the idea of free-floating probability fields. They ask "What are they made of?" It's true that it's also hard to answer the question of what are quantum probability fields made of.

But there's a problem with trying to force all natural phenomena into the same shape of distribution that's come before. First of all, as with my own hypothesis, there's the problem of creativity: What about the first one? And secondly some probabilities are passive in the sense that they describe events that just happen, like coin tossing. Others are probability fields associated with self-organising systems, like developing plants. One kind of probability depends on external forces, the other on internal organisational principles. Morphic resonance only applied to the latter.

Best

Rupert

On 11 Jul 2016, at 13:49, jeffrey E. wrote:

why would they influence rather than actually just be a probability field themselves. = it also might be fun to think of "luck" as a morphic field . I think a strong argument can be made that the power laws zipfs areto are the proofs of morphic fields. . forcing all natural phenomena into the same shape of distribution that has some before it its very very elegant. and as good a theory as any scientist can propose. =br>

On 11 Jul 2016 at 6:49 AM, Rupert Sheldrake <████████> wrote:

Dear Jeffrey,

Yes, I think Brian Josephson is indeed rather scattered.

I don't think Deepak is interested in deep theoretical issues so I don't think you'll succeed in moving him towards the study of probabilities. But I agree with you that it would be better if he stayed away from quantum phenomena which he doesn't know much about and which in relation to medicine and consciousness seem to me to create a cloud of scientific-sounding rhetoric which obscures rather than illuminates the problems.

I'm all for the idea of attractors, but I don't think mathematically so find it hard to grasp probability arguments. Although I think morphic fields are probability structures and work by influencing probabilities. =span>

We leave for a remote island in British Columbia on Wednesday and I'll be away for about 2 months. But still in email contact most of the time. =span>

Rupert

On 9 Jul 2016, at 10:53, jeffrey E. =rote:

he pointed me =o brian josephson, seems =cattered.? view? I m trying to convince depak =o move in the realm and study of probabilities and stay away from =uantum phenomena. . I think natures distributions =ushing elements to be average , describes many processes. = it appears that morphing all local faces into one (=verage) appears to be beautiful. . if things are =distributed on a bell live or normal curve, just looking at =he distribution could lead one to think there is a force pushing toward =he middle. maybe gravity is just =hat, . probability of all things being equally =distributed. appearing as a pseudo force = (like centrifugal force). the =entral limit theorem might answer many mysteries. . =erivation of the power laws for example. zipf, =span>pareto. . if the distribtuions are =he attractors. having even a distribution of esoteric =raits like happinesss could lead one to believe that if the =istribution wants to stay constant. as one point on the =urve (the person) if they become happier, the pseufo force would push =omeone else towards the average. . =nd yes - a few times depak and i roared with =aughter.

On Sat, Jul 9, 2016 at 5:30 AM, Rupert Sheldrake =span dir="ltr">>< [REDACTED]
<mailto:[REDACTED]> > =rote:

Glad to hear about your meeting. Deepak =s good company, has a broad vision, and can be hilarious =oo.

Rupert

On 8 Jul 2016, at =1:18, jeffrey E. wrote:

depak chopra was here this morning, a great fan of =ours

--

please =ote

The information contained in this communication =s confidential, may be attorney-client privileged, may constitute =nside information, and is intended only for the use of the =ddressee. It is the property of JEE

Unauthorized use, disclosure =r copying of this communication or any part thereof is strictly =rohibited and may be unlawful. If you have received =his communication in error, please notify us immediately =y return e-mail or by e-mail to jeevacation@gmail.com, and destroy this =ommunication and all copies thereof, including all attachments. =opyright -all rights reserved

--
please note

The information contained in this communication is confidential, may be attorney-client privileged, may constitute inside information, and is intended only for the use of the addressee. It is the property of JEE

Unauthorized use, disclosure or copying of this communication or any part thereof is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by return e-mail or by e-mail to jeevacation@gmail.com, and destroy this communication and all copies thereof, including all attachments. Copyright -all rights reserved

--
please note

The information contained in this communication is confidential, may be attorney-client privileged, may constitute inside information, and is intended only for the use of the addressee. It is the property of JEE

Unauthorized use, disclosure or copying of this communication or any part thereof is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by return e-mail or by e-mail to jeevacation@gmail.com, and destroy this communication and all copies thereof, including all attachments. Copyright -all rights reserved

=